

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is submitted responsive to the office action mailed October 1, 2007. Reconsideration of the application in light of the accompanying remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

In the aforesaid action, the Examiner rejected all claims over prior art. This rejection included a rejection of dependent claim 34 as anticipated by Table V of US 6,300,398 B1 (Jialanella). By the present amendment, claim 13 has been amended to present claim 34 in independent form. It is believed that this claim defines patentably over Jialanella and is allowable over all art of record. All dependent claims are also allowable due to dependence from claim 13 and also in their own right.

The Examiner has held that the first polymer disclosed in Jialanella has density of more than 0.9 g/cc, and that this indicates the presence of crystals. We continue to disagree with this statement. The density of polyethylene is a function of its degree of branching. Density of about 0.9 g/cc are just typical for low density polyethylene (LDPE) as already mentioned in Jialanella (column 3, lines 25-33). It is not possible to derive any information at all about crystallinity from the density of the polymer.

Further, claim 13 calls for the polymer mixture to comprise a molecularly dispersed mixture containing P(i) and P(j) that forms a network under heterocrystallization, and this language has been amended to correct a translation error contained in the original claim. There is no indication in Jialanella that the polymer mixture comprises a molecularly dispersed mixture containing both polymers that forms a network under heterocrystallization, and no reference to such a network has been cited in the proceedings to date.

Further, claim 13 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 34, that is, that P(j) has a polydispersivity of less than 30. The Examiner states that Table V of Jialanella discloses Mw/Mn of

about 2. However, Table V of Jialanella lists the properties of polyethylenes with high degree of polymerization, which corresponds to P(i) of the present claims. Thus, it is submitted that Jialanella also fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter from claim 34 which has been incorporated into claim 13.

Based upon the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable over the art of record for each of the separate reasons set forth above.

Dependent claims 14-33, 35-41 and 44-51 are submitted to be allowable for the reasons set forth above, as well as those presented previously.

An earnest and thorough effort has been made by the undersigned to address all issues in this application and to place the application in condition for allowance. If, upon consideration of this response, the Examiner is of the opinion that issues remain which can be addressed by telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss same.

A request for three month extension of time accompanies this paper, along with an authorization of the Deposit Account for the fee in connection with same. It is believed that no additional fee is due. If, however, any such fee or fee deficiency is due, please charge same to Deposit Account 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,
Rolf Müller et al.

By /george a. coury/
George A. Coury
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34,309
Tel: (203) 777-6628
Fax: (203) 865-0297
E-Mail: docket@bachlap.com

Date: April 1, 2008